

EVIDENCE

THAT THE

RELATION OF JOSEPHUS^K

CONCERNING

HEROD'S HAVING NEW BUILT

THE

TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM

IS EITHER

FALSE OR MISINTERPRETED.

*Charles Hawtree M.A.
Rector of Bampton.
Oxon*

O X F O R D :

PRINTED FOR J. FLETCHER IN THE TURLE.

AND SOLD BY MESS. RIVINGTON IN ST. PAUL'S
CHURCH-YARD; AND T. PAYNE AND SON,
AT THE MEWS GATE, LONDON.

MDCCLXXXVI.



[2]

INTRODUCTORY to the evidence, intended here to be produced, of the falsehood of Josephus's relation concerning the Temple, which, he says, was entirely taken down and rebuilt upon new foundations by Herod, it will be necessary first, to state the reason of the objections which are made to his relation.

The reason of the objections, in a few words, is plainly this. If Josephus's relation is true, the Prophecy of Haggai will be proved to be a false prophecy, for both cannot be true. The Prophecy is in these words:

“ * Thus saith the Lord of hosts ; Yet once,
“ it is a little while, and I will shake the
“ heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and
“ the dry land ; And I will shake all nations,
“ and the desire of all nations shall come :
“ and I will fill this House with glory, saith
“ the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and
“ the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts.
“ The glory of this latter House shall be
“ greater than of the former, saith the Lord
“ of hosts : and in this place will I give peace,
“ saith the Lord of hosts.” That these words

* Haggai ii. 6, 7, 8, 9,

were spoken in consequence of the second Temple, then building, and whose foundations had been laid under the decree of Cyrus, will not be denied; and equally undeniable is it, that they convey a promise that this Temple should be filled with greater glory than Solomon's was. Now, let the word glory be supposed to signify whatever it may, either the presence and glory of God, or silver, gold, and other external ornaments and decorations, it still will be the same. If Josephus's relation is true, the Prophecy never was fulfilled, and now never can be fulfilled, and therefore is a false prophecy. No one ever heard or said that Haggai's Temple was more glorious in external splendor or magnificence than Solomon's; and most certain it is, if Herod took it entirely down, and built a new one in its room, before the coming of the Messiah, that it never was filled with a greater glory of the Lord than that which filled the temple of Solomon; for, in fact, it never had any glory of the Lord at all in it as Solomon's had. So that the matter must inevitably be brought to this issue—Either Haggai was a false Prophet, or Josephus a false Historian. As for accommodating matters there is no such thing—it is impossible. “I will fill THIS House with glory” can never be interpreted to signify, I will fill the
house

house which Herod shall build 500 years hence with glory, neither is there any metaphorical interpretation deviseable, which will render the prophecy a true Prophecy. If Herod really did take the Temple down, and build a new one in its room, what Haggai propheth of the Temple then building, never had any accomplishment. Indeed, the learned Doctor Heberden suggesteth, that Haggai's Temple was equal in riches and splendor to Solomon's : his words are— " The vessels of
 " the first Temple, which had been taken
 " away by Nebuchadnezzar, were restored
 " by Cyrus. Presents, according to Ezra
 " (chap.i.) were made to the second Temple
 " by Artaxerxes and his courtiers, as well as
 " by the Jews themselves. The yearly in-
 " crease of gold and silver and precious stones,
 " circulating in the hands of men, the con-
 " stant improvement of arts, the increase of
 " trade among the Jews, during the time of
 " the second Temple, and their numerous set-
 " tlements in various parts of the world, from
 " which they could send all sorts of costly
 " presents to Jerusalem ; all these considera-
 " tions make it probable, that the second
 " Temple was in no respect inferior to the
 " first, except in the want of the Ark and the
 " Shechinah." Thus this learned Doctor, as

we find it in the *Bishop of Waterford's Book on the Prophets*, p. 171. But what is this? At best it is only a conjecture of his own; and, though he calls it probable, it nevertheless is very far from being so: but, were it otherwise, it is yet totally insufficient to establish the truth of the Jewish Prophet. For *Haggai* doth not prophecy that the second Temple shall be in no respect inferior to the first, but that it shall be greatly superior to it. And therefore, except the Doctor's conjecture extended much farther than it doth, it can have no possible tendency towards establishing the truth of the Prophecy, and consequently the position, already laid down, will be uncontroversible—that either *Haggai* was a false Prophet, or *Josephus* a false Historian. That *Josephus* was a false Historian—that when he says *Herod* intirely took down the second Temple, removed all the foundations of it, laid new foundations—that he then said what was most untrue it is imagined will be fully and satisfactorily proved in the following pages.

If, then, *Herod* really did perform what *Josephus* hath ascribed to him, then was the Temple destroyed by *Titus* as totally and intirely different from *Haggai's* Temple as *Haggai's* Temple was from *Solomon's*; and of course,

course, three Temples having been constructed, *de novo*, at Jerusalem; the Temple which was destroyed by Titus was not the second but the third Temple. But where, when, or by whom, Jews or Christians, was it ever spoken of, or referred to, as a third Temple? Even Josephus himself does not denominate it a third Temple; and all other writers, that have occasion to speak of it, speak of it as the second Temple. Would they have done so, and particularly the more antient writers, if they had known it to be otherwise? Would they have spoken of it as the second Temple, as the Temple built by Haggai, when at the same time they knew it was a third Temple built by Herod, and not that which was built by Haggai? Would all the Jewish Doctors and Rabbies, both antient and modern, have expressed themselves, as it is notorious they do express themselves, in expectation of a third Temple, to be constructed for the reception of the Messiah, whom they expect, if they had known that a third Temple had been already constructed, and that it was the Temple which was destroyed by Titus? What inducement could they possibly have to say they expected a third and not a fourth Temple, except it be that they knew, and were persuaded, that no third Temple had ever

ever been constructed? This uniform concurrence in the writers of every age, and of every denomination, is a very strong convincing argument that Josephus doth not speak truth, when he saith that Herod took away the foundations of the old, and built a new Temple in its room. But let it be supposed for a moment, that this uniform concurrence among writers took its rise from some mistake, and so the Jews never made, in their popular language, any nominal distinction between Haggai's Temple, and that which Josephus says was built by Herod. Yet, when did this mistake arise? Nay, how was it possible that it could arise? The Jews, when they saw the whole of the second Temple taken down to the ground, all the foundations of it grubbed up and removed, could not possibly fancy that the second Temple was then standing, when at the same time they saw there was no Temple at all. They could not imagine, when they saw the Jewish Historian's edifice erected with different materials, and upon different foundations, that it was the very same building which they had, but a little before with their own eyes, seen pulled down to the ground, and consequently knew that it was not the same building. They could not possibly say or conceive, that the
 Temple

Temple at Jerusalem had been only twice built, when, at the same time, they saw and knew (if any such thing happened) that it had been built three times. Mistakes certainly may, and often do, arise; but then they never arise without some cause, though ever so trifling. But here there does not appear any, even the most distant cause or foundation for a mistake. They could not even speak of the Temple and its construction without declaring it to be a third Temple; for, as it was Herod's Temple, it was therefore not Haggai's Temple; and as Haggai's Temple was the second, therefore this, which was posterior to Haggai's, must be a third; and therefore, if at any time through accident they had spoken of it as the second, their minds would naturally have revolted at the sound, and they would have corrected themselves, as conscious that they had spoken of it in false terms.

But there is a second argument against the truth of the Jewish Historian's relation, and it is this—If Herod really did effect what is ascribed to him, then for a year and half, by his own account, (but it must have been a much longer time) there was no Temple at Jerusalem; and of course there must have been, for that time, a suspension of all sacred offices.

offices *. There could be no presentations in the Temple, for there was no Temple to be presented in ; no sacrifices, for there was no altar on which they might be offered ; no expiation could be made, for there was no Holy of Holies into which the high priest could enter ; and, in short, in what respected the sacred offices, the Jews must for the time have been reduced to as wretched a state as that in which they were under the Babylonish Captivity. Now, what provision hath Josephus in his history made for an exigency of this kind ? *Altum silentium*, not a syllable doth he say upon the subject. At the expence of truth he hath aggrandiz'd his Hero ; and, forgetting what consequences would be derived from the aggrandizement, he hath left

* The learned Dr. Prideaux (sub anno ante Christum 17.) supposes, that the Temple was not made fit for divine service under nine years and an half ; which supposition will render the Historian's account still more extravagantly ridiculous and incredible. But in this the learned Doctor seems to be mistaken, and to have been deceived by the negligent and confused account which the Historian has given of the matter ; who says, that the Temple was built by the priests in a year and an half, and the exterior parts and porticos by Herod in eight years ; not meaning hereby that Herod was eight years at work distinct from the time employed by the priests, for the works were carrying on at the same time, but in the whole, that the works were carrying on for eight years, and that the work of the priests was finished in a year and an half of that time. Eight years surely is long enough in all conscience for the Jews to have been without any Temple fit for divine service.

the

the whole body of his countrymen for a year and half, without a possibility of worshipping the God of their fathers according to his own divine law ; and he hath left them patiently submitting to this deplorable condition without uttering a single complaint against it. And for whom, and for what, did they submit to this ? For Herod, a wretch whom they most entirely detested ! and to gratify the vanity of a man, or rather a monster, whom they would willingly have destroyed ! Surely all this must be too much even for the most extended credulity.

But say that Herod really did apply to them for their consent to take down the Temple, and to build a new one. Would they ? Did they dare, setting every other consideration aside, to have given their consent ? Most certainly not ; superstitious and scrupulous as the Jews are known to have been upon every the most trifling occasion. Their superstition, if such it may be called, must have arisen to the highest degree upon such an occasion as this, and they never would have suffered a Temple, venerable upon so many accounts, to have been pulled down, and in a manner desecrated, for no other imaginable end but that of gratifying Herod's pride. The Historian does not pretend that there was any such defect in it

B

as

as to make it necessary to be all taken down; the whole that he alledges is, that it was neither so large nor so high as Solomon's. And was this a reason sufficient for taking it down? Could this pretence, and no other is alledged, have induced the Jews to consent to its demolition?—They, who valued themselves so much upon having a Temple distinguished by such a number of extraordinary circumstances, and built by divine appointment? Of this Temple it was that Isaiah prophecied long before its foundations were laid. This was the Temple concerning which the decree of Cyrus was issued in conformity with the Prophecy. This the Temple that was erected under the immediate inspection of two Prophets, Haggai and Zecariah, and concerning which it was promised, that the Lord of hosts would fill it with greater glory, and consequently that it should exceed even the Temple of Solomon. Now, who that reflects on these circumstances, and how even bigotted the Jews always were to their Temple, can persuade himself that they would forego all these illustrious honours, and expectations, and surrender themselves up to the solicitations of a vainglorious tyrant and alien, who was their abhorrence? Easy of persuasion must he indeed be who can conceive

ceive it possible, and much more easy of persuasion who can believe it to have been a fact.

The Historian does indeed tell us, that they demurred a little at first, when Herod proposed the matter to them ; and the only reason of the demurr which he assigns is—They were afraid lest, when Herod had taken the Temple down, he should not be able to build them another in its room. But, acquainted as we are with the very stubborn attachment of the Jews to their Temple, we may be certain this would not have been their only objection to the proposal. It was their triumph to be distinguished from the rest of the world by the glory and privileges of their Temple, of which they could justly boast, that it was erected for them by the command of the Deity himself, under the immediate inspection of his Prophets ; and therefore, we may be sure they never would have consented to exchange this for a Temple of Herod's building, which had no promises annexed to it, and was unsupported by any divine sanction. If, therefore, Herod really did make any proposal to them of the kind mentioned by the Historian, this most probably would have been their first and immediate answer to him —“ We will never consent that our Temple shall be taken down unless you can produce

full and certain an authority from God for doing it, as we can shew you for its having been erected." Their second answer and objection would have been—"If the Temple is taken down, we shall be left without any place of worship, and there must necessarily be a suspension of all sacred offices till a new one is constructed, and therefore we can not consent to it." And their third answer may be, that which the Historian hath made for them. Which last, being the only one of the three objections which it was possible to obviate, he has taken no notice of the other two, which it is hardly possible to suppose were not made, if Herod really did make any such proposal as Josephus hath related.

And here, having mentioned the divine authority by which the second Temple was erected, will be the proper place to take notice of what Philo says in his embassy; and his evidence must be unexceptionable and conclusive, as it is impossible but he must have known whether the Temple at Jerusalem, which Caligula wanted to profane, was a Temple of Herod's building, or was the Temple built under the inspection and prophecy of Haggai; by the appointment and command of God. His words are these; having spoken of Caligula's intention of setting
up

up his own image in the Temple at Jerusalem, in an apostrophe to him—*τὶ φῆς· σὺ μὲν ἄνθρωπος ὢν αἰθέρα καὶ κρανὸν ζητεῖς προσλαβεῖν, &c. τὸν δὲ θεὸν ἐδένος τῶν ἐνταῦθα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀξιοῖς, εἰ χώρας, εἰ πόλεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ, τὸν βραχὺν ἔτως περικύλον αὐτῷ καθιερωθέντα καὶ καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς καὶ λογίοις θεσφάτοις ἀφελέσθαι διανοῇ;* “Dost thou not think that God is worthy to partake of any thing with thee in this world, &c. but meditatest even how to take from him his own little Temple, which hath been sanctified and consecrated to himself by his own divine oracles and prophecies?” The warmest partisans of Josephus must surely allow that these words are totally inapplicable to any Temple of Herod's building. Descriptive, and very strongly descriptive, they most certainly are of the Temple which was built under the Prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, but of no other which was not as that was *καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς καὶ λογίοις θεσφάτοις*, therefore, they are very strong and convincing evidence that when Philo wrote Haggai's Temple was still standing, and of course that it never had been taken down by Herod, in order to erect a new one in its room. And it is material here to observe; that, if Herod really had taken down the old Temple, Philo was of such an age that he must have remembered it;

it; and, remembering it, he never could have said that it was established under the sanction of divine oracles and prophecies; when, at the same time, he himself knew that it was entirely built without any divine oracle or prophecy at all, and purely to gratify the pride and ambition of Herod, who wanted thereby to perpetuate his own memory.

But this is not all. There is another passage in Philo which most plainly shews that he knew nothing of Herod's modern Temple. For, in the relation of his embassy, having told how certain persons had brought the melancholly news to them of Caligula's intention of setting up his own image in the Temple at Jerusalem, and the distress and astonishment it had occasioned to them, he adds, that, when they were a little recovered, they desired those who brought the news to explain if they knew what it was that had occasioned the Emperor to proceed to such extremities. The answer they received he then sets down, in which, among other things, are these words, speaking of the Temple—

*κατήχηται δὲ ὅτι καὶ πάντων ἱερῶν τῶν πανταχοῦ καὶ ἁγίων
ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀπείρων χρόνων ἀπαύτοις καὶ ἀφειδέσι δαπάναις
ἀεὶ προσκοσμούμενον* i. e. “He hath been told
that it is the grandest and most magnificent
Temple in the world, having been continu-
ally

ally adorned and beautified through a long succession of ages at a constant and boundless expence." Is there any perversion of language by which these words can be applied to a Temple of Herod's building, which, to Philo, must have been so modern a structure, only of the other day, and which, at the time of his writing, had not been finished more than 44 years? But, once more—If Herod really did effect what Josephus has ascribed to him, one would think Agrippa, who was his grandson, must have known something of it; but it is very evident, from his Epistle to Caligula, that he was an entire stranger to any such thing. He beseeches him in behalf of the Temple at Jerusalem, into which he says no figure made with hands was ever ἐξ ἀρχῆς suffered to be introduced, "Our forefathers, says he, having deemed it wicked, either to paint or make any image of the invisible God." He then proceeds, and with most wonderful art suggests to him how extremely dangerous it would be, if he should proceed to profane the Temple, by setting up his image in it. "Many who had no great veneration for the Temple, and would have been glad of an opportunity of violating its sacred laws, yet dared not do it, because they knew what calamitous and dreadful punishment had

had been inflicted on those who had violated them." Herein referring to the punishment inflicted on Antiochus Epiphanes, who had actually done what Caligula was about to do, and had placed the image of Jupiter Olympus upon the Altar. Here then Agrippa, in pleading for the Temple that then was at Jerusalem, and for its preservation from being profaned, plainly intimates, that it had been profaned, and that dreadful vengeance had been the consequence of the profanation; but he never would have intimated this of a Temple which (if it was a fact) he himself knew had been built by his Grandfather, and had never been profaned at all. Therefore the Temple, which then was at Jerusalem, and which he pleaded for, was not a new Temple of Herod's building, but was the old Temple which had been erected by Haggai the Prophet, and which had suffered under the profanation of Antiochus Epiphanes. Moreover, if he had known that the Temple had been built by his Grandfather, in the course of his letter he would have mentioned, or hinted at something of the kind; but not a syllable escapes him that has the least tendency that way. On the contrary, when, he had so direct an opportunity of making the Emperor's grandfather, M. Agrippa, amongst his other encomiums

comiums on the Temple, extol the princely magnificence of Herod in building it, he says nothing at all upon the subject, only signifies that he was so charmed with the structure, the services, the order of the priests, the splendid dignity of the high priest, &c. that he could talk of nothing else. Was it possible he could admire, and be in such raptures with the Temple, and every thing belonging to it, and yet take no notice of the princely grandeur and munificence of its builder, whose guest at the same time he was? It cannot be, as neither can it if he had taken notice of it, that Agrippa in his letter would have suppressed the mention of it, when it tended to reflect so much honour on himself, who was the grandson of Herod. Surely all this evidence, when well weighed, and laid together, will be sufficient to correct the notion which has gone abroad, and so prevailed concerning Herod's having entirely taken down the whole of Haggai's Temple and built an entire new one in its room, upon new foundations; a notion founded on the single testimony of Josephus alone, who certainly does appear to say as much, and, if he does not, hath as certainly been misinterpreted. It will be proper, therefore, now to take a view of, and examine minutely, the

several parts of the Jewish Historian's testimony; and if it should be found upon examination that his testimony is abundant in irreconcilable contradictions, it is to be hoped it will never more be produced for the purpose of invalidating the truth of the Prophecy of Haggai. That Josephus was very well skilled in the art of contradicting himself, (unless we suppose the Antiquities, and the History of the Jewish War not to have been the product of the same pen) appears on many occasions, of which the following is a pretty remarkable instance.

In the preface to his Antiquities he tells us, that he had undertaken the work for the purpose of accommodating the Greeks, to whom it could not but be very acceptable; and that he had thoughts, when he wrote the History of the Jewish War, of prefixing to that history an account of the Jewish antiquities, &c. But in his preface to his History of the Jewish War, he tells us quite another story, namely, that Ἀρχαιολογεῖν τὰ Ἰουδαίων was a very useless and unnecessary work on many accounts; and particularly, because many Jewish writers had before him treated of that subject with great precision and fidelity, and because they had been translated into the Greek language with very tolerable accuracy and

and exactness. If it was a very useless and unnecessary work for him, when he wrote the Jewish War, to give an account of the Jewish antiquities for the reasons he here assigns, did not those reasons subsist as strongly after he had written the History of the War as before? And how could he say, in the introduction to his Antiquities, that he had had thoughts of writing and prefixing them to his History of the War, when, in the opening of that history, he declares plainly that he never had any such thoughts, because it was quite unnecessary and superfluous? Perhaps there may be a method of reconciling these contraries; but what that method is at present does not appear. However, not to pursue matters of this nature any farther, let us now attend to what he says concerning the Temple.

In his History of the War, then, he thus expresses himself (B. 1. ch. 21.) Πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ γὰρ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας, αὐτὸν τε τὸν ναὸν ἐπεσκευάσε, καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν, ἀνετείχισατὸ χώραν, τῆς ἔσης διπλασίαν, ἀμέτροις μὲν χρησάμενος τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν, ἀνυπερβλήτω δὲ τῇ πολυτελείᾳ. “ In the fifteenth year, then, of his reign (speaking of Herod) he both repaired the Temple itself, and taking in a space of ground as large again as was to it before, he surrounded it with a wall, which he built with

the utmost magnificence, and without setting any bounds to his expence upon the occasion." Here, then, the Historian expressly says, that what Herod did to the Temple was done in the fifteenth year of his reign, when he was in possession of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, as he mentions in the conclusion of the preceding chapter; when he was in such high estimation both with Cæsar and with Agrippa, that Cæsar loved him next to Agrippa, and Agrippa preferred no one before him but Cæsar. Thus blessed, says he, his mind dilated itself, and he began to turn his thoughts towards works which might be for the honour of religion. In the fifteenth year therefore of his reign he both repaired the Temple &c.

Here likewise it is to be particularly taken notice of, that the Historian says expressly that Herod REPAIRED the Temple, for such and no other in this place is the construction of the word *επισκευασε*—and that he then built those noble porticos which were round the Temple, and repaired and ornamented the castle of Antonia. All this the Historian expressly says was done in the fifteenth year of Herod's reign.

In the fifth book of his History of the War, he gives a very particular and prolix description

description of the Temple, and speaks of the nine gates, which were superbly ornamented, being plated over with gold and silver by Alexander, the father of Tiberius, but names not Herod, throughout the whole account, till he comes to speak of the castle of Antonia; and this, he says, was ἔργον Ἡρώδου βασιλέως, in which he displayed the magnificence of his princely spirit. Hence it may very fairly be concluded, that at this time the Historian knew nothing of Herod's having rebuilt the Temple; for if he had, as that would have been a much greater display of his magnificent spirit, he surely would have taken notice of it, which he does not, but passes him over in a profound silence, as if he had not had any hand even in the repairs and decorations of the Temple. Beside what has been already mentioned, it does not appear that Josephus takes any farther notice of Herod as concerned with the Temple, except where he mentions the affair of the golden eagle, and that shall be considered by and by. Let us now turn to the Antiquities, and see how what he says there will correspond with what has been already related.

In the tenth chapter of his Antiquities, B. xv, he tells us, that towards the conclusion

sion of the 17th year of Herod's reign, Cæsar came into Syria; and, on the death of Zenodorus, gave Herod his tetrarchy; that Herod's felicity was at this time risen to the greatest height—Καῖσαρ μὲν ἔδενα μετ' Ἀγρίππαν Ἡρώδης προετίμησε, Ἀγρίππας δὲ μετὰ Καίσαρα πρῶτον ἀπιδίδε Φιλίας τόπον Ἡρώδη—and that, after these things had taken place (as he says in the next chapter) in the 18th year of his reign, Herod undertook a work of some consequence, ἡ τὸ τυχόν, which was τὸν νεῶν τῷ Θεῷ δι' αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσασθαι, μίζω τὸν περίβολον ἢ πρὸς ὑψὺς ἀξιοπρεπέστατον ἐγείρειν. Here, then, the first difficulty occurs; and it is how to reconcile what is here said with the account given us by the same Historian, in his History of the Jewish War. There he says, that in the fifteenth year he actually did repair the Temple; that then he was in possession of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, and in the highest estimation with Cæsar and Agrippa; and here he says, that he did not obtain the tetrarchy till towards the conclusion of the 17th year of his reign, and that in the 18th he had his ἔργον ἡ τὸ τυχόν in contemplation only. Ingenious men have endeavoured to solve the difficulty, but without effect; it is a difficulty that admits of no solution. The Historian most assuredly contradicts himself.

The

The next difficulty that occurs is, that here, at least in this chapter, he in plain terms seems to tell us, that Herod took down the whole Temple, and built a new one upon new foundations, and that it was entered upon in about two years after his first having had it in contemplation, i. e. in the 21st year of his reign. But if this is true, the account he gives in his History of the Jewish War is false; for there he says that he only repaired the temple. How is this to be reconciled? It will not help us in the least to suppose that both accounts are true; for, if they are both true, then both Herod and all the people of the Jews must have been out of their senses, and distracted. In the 15th year of his reign, he repaired the Temple (says the Historian), and enlarged it, surrounded it with walls most sumptuously built, of the magnificence of which those noble porticos which were round the Temple were plain convincing evidence; and all this was done at a most incredible expence. Who, then, can believe that, after having done all this, after having repaired, enlarged and beautified the Temple, within the space of four or five years, he would take it all down merely for the sake of building it all up again? If any one can suppose this to be either probable

probable or possible, it cannot be without a supposition, at the same time, that Herod and all his people were mad. But, moreover, if the account here given in his Antiquities be a true account, how happened it that Josephus knew nothing of it when he wrote his History of the War? He certainly knew as much of Herod's history then as he did afterwards, at least upon so very remarkable an occasion as this. If he could know that Herod at an incredible expence had repaired and enlarged the Temple, he certainly must have known if it was a fact, that he had enlarged and built the Temple all new from the ground at his own expence; and if he knew it, what possible inducement could he have for suppressing his knowledge of it? When he mentions Herod's having repaired and enlarged the Temple, he mentions it as a work *euergetas*, and that did great honour to his character; but surely, if he had known any thing of his having done more than repair the Temple he would have told it, as reflecting greater honour on his character, but he says nothing of it, nor gives the slightest intimation of any such thing. Therefore the account of the transaction, given in the Antiquities becomes the less credible. But let us attend a little to the account he gives

he gives us in his Antiquities, B. xv. ch. 2. "In the 18th year of his reign, Herod formed the design *κατασκευάσασθαι μείζω τὸν περιβόλον* of enlarging the Temple of God, and of raising it to a greater and becoming height; but, finding that the people did not readily concur with him in approving his design, he assembled them together, and addressed them in a formal harangue." In words to this effect the Historian introduces the account he is going to give us of Herod's operations on the Temple, where observe that he neither says nor intimates that Herod had formed a design of taking down the old Temple and building a new one in its room; for, though interpreters have rendered *κατασκευάσασθαι*, ædificare, ut ædificatum iret, &c. the word here hath no such signification.

After the introduction he sets down the words of his Hero's harangue, and neither in this doth he make him talk as if it was his intention to take the Temple down and build a new one. He tells the Jews, "that their fathers, after their return from Babylon, built this Temple to the Supreme God, but that it was by no means equal to the Temple which had been built by Solomon; for besides that it was not so large, it wanted sixty cubits of being as high as that was. That they were not to be blamed on account of this defect,

D

for

for they were restrained by Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes in its first foundations ; and afterwards, through a variety of causes, had no opportunity of making it such as it ought to have been, and equal to the Temple of Solomon. But now, says he, I having obtained the kingdom, being in a state of profound peace, and particularly in friendship with the Romans ; being in possession of great wealth, and a very large revenue, will endeavour to rectify those defects in the Temple, which were derived from the necessity and servitude of former times," &c. Here then it is to be observed, that neither the Historian himself, nor Herod in the harangue which the Historian has made for him, say a word that can be interpreted of taking down the Temple which their fathers had built, and of erecting a new one in its room ; and therefore the reader cannot help being very much surprised when he finds, in the Historian's next paragraph, that he represents the Jews astonished at what Herod had said to them, and frightened out of their wits, lest when he had taken the Temple down, he should not have wherewithal to build them another ; whereas he had not said a syllable to them about taking it down. How therefore they could put such a construction

tion upon his words is difficult to say. Certain it is, the Historian seems to tell us they did put this construction upon them, and that Herod, in return, engages to them ἔ πρότερον καθαιρήσκειν τὸν ναὸν that he will not take down the Temple till he has got every thing ready for finishing it completely again; and therefore it is to be supposed the words of Herod were intended to signify what the Jews apprehended them to signify, although the words themselves appear not to have the least tendency towards any such signification. Upon such a subject as this it is difficult to know what to say.

After then he has told us that every thing was settled between Herod and the Jews, concerning the plan of operations, he next informs us in these words—Ἀνελών δὲ τὰς ἀρχαῖας θεμελίους καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἐτέρας ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε, μήκει μὲν ἑκατὸν ὄντα πηχῶν, τὸ δὲ ὕψος εἴκοσι περιτλοῖς, ἐς τῷ χρόνῳ σιμίζουσάντων τῶν θεμελίων ὑπέβη. Whatever the Historian might have intended to signify by these words, the common interpretation put upon them is, that “having removed the old foundations, and laid others upon them, he built the Temple one hundred cubits in length, and in height, twenty more; but these in time, as the foundation settled, gave way.” And what-

ever may be said on the subject of the twenty cubits having failed through some defect in the foundation, which architects in general conceive improbable to have happened, this passage is nevertheless thought to be plain evidence that Herod did not merely repair, but that he did actually rebuild the Temple, *de novo*; which is supposed to be farther confirmed by what the Historian says in the conclusion of this chapter, where his words are to this effect: "Now the Temple having been built by the priests in a year and six months, all the people were filled with gladness, and returned thanks to God for the quick despatch with which it was finished, and for the King's attention to them; with much festivity celebrating τὴν ἀνάκτισιν the feast of the new building." He then adds something that must appear very extraordinary: He says, "the King upon this occasion offered up a sacrifice of three hundred oxen, and others offered according to their ability, but what he could not say:" ἐκφεύγει γὰρ το δύνασθαι πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εἰπεῖν—i. e. he had forgot: and he finishes his chapter with something perhaps still more extraordinary—"It is reported, that at that time, when the Temple was building, no rain fell in the day, but only in the night-time some gentle

gentle showers, so that the work met with no interruption; καὶ τὸν λόγον οἱ πατέρες ἡμῖν παρέδωκαν and this tradition our forefathers have handed down to us." Is it usual for people to talk of events as it were of yesterday being handed down to them by tradition? And then, as a finishing stroke, he says of this wonderful event—"This is not at all incredible, if any one will reflect on the many other displays of his favour towards us, which God hath made in our behalf." But what occasion for this reflecting, if it was a fact? Many of Josephus's own relations, who were alive at the time, must have known it to be so, and he might have alleged them in testimony of its truth, without any of this parade. Nay, it is not impossible, that, when this account was written, some persons might have been still alive who remembered the whole transaction, and consequently he might have had living evidences to have appealed to for the truth of it. But, alas! it all so very strongly *olet mendacium*, that this single circumstance which he has recorded is sufficient of itself alone to destroy the credit of his whole account. However, for the present, let us suppose this circumstance not to have been recorded, and that the Historian has very satisfactorily assured

us,

us, that *Herod had taken down the old Temple, and erected another new and very splendid one, upon new foundations, to be an eternal monument* *πρὸς αἰῶνιον μνημενὸν* *of his munificence.*

Let us now examine how what he says farther concerning Herod will correspond with this account. It seems then (B. xvii. ch. 6.) that the King having provided a very valuable offering, namely, a large golden eagle; it was placed over the great gate of the Temple. This giving great offence to two very celebrated and popular doctors among the Jews, they suggested to their disciples that this eagle was erected contrary to the law, which did not allow them to make or consecrate an image of any kind whatsoever, and that it ought to be destroyed. Fired by these suggestions of their teachers, and a report having been spread that the King was dead, the young men go without any hesitation into the Temple, pull the Eagle down, and chop it in pieces. Upon this occasion Herod convenes an assembly of all the chief persons among the Jews; and when they were met, he upbraids them with their ill behaviour—"He bids them reflect on what he had undergone for their sakes; and, to benefit them, how largely he had contributed towards the repairs of the Temple,

by

by an expence which none of the Hasamō-
næan kings, during the 125 years of their
reigns, were equal to—That he had orna-
mented the Temple with presents of great
value, and which ought not to be forgotten ;
and that he was in hopes they would have
been a means of perpetuating an honourable
memorial of himself, even after he was
dead.” Is this the language of a man who,
if the Historian is rightly interpreted, built
the Temple from the very foundations all at
his own expence ? Would such an one say
only, and here it is reported to be all that he
did say concerning it, that they should recol-
lect *τὴν ἰσχύα τὴν κατασκευὴν*—Why did he not say
τὴν ἀνάκτισιν ; Would a man, who had built
the whole Temple new from the ground,
bid them reflect on the *rich presents which he
had made to the Temple* ? The thoughts of
the presents he had made to the Temple
would have been all lost in the greater pre-
sent he had made them of the Temple it-
self. And moreover, would that very man,
who is before represented as building the
whole Temple, *de novo*, for an eternal mo-
nument of his own munificence—*πρὸς αἰώ-
νιον μνῆμην*—would he say, as he is here re-
presented, that he was in hopes *the presents
he had made to the Temple* would have perpe-
tuated

tuated the memorial of himself, even after his death?—*κἄν μετα θάνατον μνήμην τε αὐτῶν εὐκλειαν*. But besides all this, there is another very material part of his address to them, which seems plainly to discover what the Historian (if indeed such was his design) endeavoured to conceal.

When he bids them reflect on *τὰ ναῶν κατασκευὴν*, he tells them, that “during the 125 years that the Hasamonæan Kings reigned, they had never been able to do any thing like this for the honour of God.” What, in the name of goodness, had these kings to do, to be introduced here upon such a subject as this? They had never built a new Temple to God, or attempted it, or even had thought of such a thing: why, therefore, are they thus brought into the comparison? The Jews knew very well that those kings had never built them a new Temple, and (if it was a fact) that Herod had; and therefore it appears to have been a very useless business, and quite foreign to the matter in hand, for him to say, that during the whole period that they reigned, they had not been able to do what they never attempted, or even thought of doing; and yet, at the same time, by his introducing them in this manner, and comparing himself with them, as he does, it
seems

seems there must have been some very substantial reason for it. By his bringing them thus into the comparison, it presupposes that these kings had been great benefactors to the Jews, and to their Temple; and that he, during the short time that he had reigned over them, had done more than they had been able to do in 125 years. It is a tacit acknowledgment, likewise, that their benefactions had been of a similar nature with his own. But their benefactions, it is certain, did not consist in building a new Temple, and therefore neither did his. They had built the castle adjoining to the Temple, which they called *Baris*, but he ταυτην την βάριν ὀχυρωτέραν κατεσκευάσε. They had ornamented and repaired the Temple, but Herod τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν ἀνετειχίσατο χώραν, τῆς ἕσης διπλασίαν ἀμέτροις μὲν χρησάμενος τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν, &c. Moreover, if Herod really had done as he is conceived to have done, that is, if he had taken down the whole Temple, removed all the foundations of it, laid new ones upon a much larger scale, and built them up a new and splendid Temple, all at his own expence; he then not only would have done more than the Hasamonæan kings had done, but more than ever had been done for them since the time of Solomon. How idle then must it

E

have

have been for him to have alledged that he had done more for them than these kings, when at the same time he had outdone all that ever went before him, Solomon only excepted ?

Who can give any tolerable account of this ? Who can assign any sufficient reason why Herod, in a speech wherein he endeavours to enhance the value of his benefactions, should use a language that did not in any degree express the value of them, rather than use a language that did ? Therefore, upon the whole, this passage appears to be so palpably adverse to the notion that has prevailed, of Herod's having built the Temple at Jerusalem, that we are compelled to suppose, that either the Historian in his account of the business hath expressed himself with inaccuracy, or that he has wilfully and designedly told a direct falsehood ; either that his relation is not true, or so negligently expressed as to be liable to misinterpretation.

It has been already observed, that in the time of Caligula it was not known that the Temple at Jerusalem was of Herod's building, and at his expence. Caligula had heard a very different account of it ; that it was raised to the splendor in which it then was
by

by the liberality of a long succession of ages. Agrippa, likewise, who was grandson to Herod, it appears plainly, knew nothing of this famous exploit of his Grandfather; he understood that the same Temple was then standing which had been profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes, and therefore could not have been built by his Grandfather. And Philo, who was of such an age that he must himself have remembered the building of it, if Herod had built it, yet most clearly shews that he knew nothing at all of any such thing; on the contrary, by his saying that the Temple, which was standing when he wrote his Embassy, was καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς καὶ λογίοις θεοφάνεις, he proves as plainly as man can do, that does not use the very words that the *Temple at Jerusalem was not built by Herod*: Consistent with these testimonies, is likewise the testimony even of Josephus himself, and of all later writers. For in his History of the War (B. vi, ch. 4.) he says, that from the first building of the Temple by Solomon, to the destruction which happened in the second year of the Emperor Vespasian, were one thousand one hundred and thirty years, seven months and fifteen days: but from the last building of it, which was done by Haggai in the second year of

Cyrus Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ὕστερον ἣν ἔτει δευτέρῳ Κύρις βασι-
 λεύοντος ἐποιήσατο Ἀγγαῖος &c. to the destruction
 of it by Vespasian, were six hundred and
 thirty nine years and forty five days. Plainer
 testimony than this need not be required.

The Historian himself declares in undis-
 guised terms, that he knew only of two
 buildings of the Temple; the one by Solo-
 mon, the other by Haggai; and, as he tells
 us that Haggai's was the last, therefore no
 third Temple was ever built: consequently
 none was ever built by Herod. It is mate-
 rial here to observe, that the Historian, when
 he speaks of Haggai's Temple, uses the word
 ὕστερον, and not δευτέρον; and it is well known
 that ὕστερον, used adverbially with the article,
 generally signifies the last of any thing about
 which it is used, and in this place certainly
 doth; and therefore there is no room for any
 salvo, or for explaining it away. The His-
 torian certainly hath used a term which de-
 termines Haggai's to have been the last Tem-
 ple that ever was built at Jerusalem, and
 therefore all that hath been said concerning
 Herod's Temple must be a fiction. Hence
 Josephus, when he saith that Herod removed
 the foundations of Haggai's Temple, and
 built a new one upon other foundations, must
 be a false Historian, and no credit ought to
 be

be given to him in opposition to the Prophet. If what he says is true, the Prophet is no true Prophet; but, from the evidence here produced, it is most plain that what he says is not true, for it is contrary to the testimony of all those antients, who say that it was the second Temple that was destroyed by Titus. It is contrary to the evidence produced from Philo. It is contrary to our own reason likewise, which will not suffer us to admit so improbable a fact, as that the Jews would consent to have a Temple, so circumstanced as was the second, with such privileges and promises annexed to it, pulled down, merely to gratify the pride of Herod, and be left, till it was rebuilt, without a possibility of worshipping the God of their Fathers, according to his divine law; and lastly, what the Historian says is not true, because it is in direct contradiction to the evidence which he himself hath given. Hence, then, we may fearlessly assert the truth of the Prophet Haggai, and affirm that the *Messiah's* presence did add to the glory of the Temple which was building in the time of Haggai; for that Temple was never pulled down till it was destroyed by Titus.

Let us now proceed to consider matters in another point of view. Hitherto the Historian

rian

rian has been presumed really to say what his interpreters have ascribed to him; and he has been argued against as if he really did say what they have ascribed to him. But it is now time that we proceed to enquire whether he doth indeed say what they have ascribed to him, and whether the whole is not a blunder derived from inattention in the interpreters of Josephus, and from the lax, confused, contradictory, and even romancing account which he himself hath given us of this matter in his Antiquities.

The chief argument in proof of Herod's having entirely new built the Temple, is drawn from these words, which have been already noticed—*Ἀνελών δὲ τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίους καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἑτέρας ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ναὸν ᾠγειρε δ&c.* Nothing, it is thought, can be more plain, more intelligible, and more positive, than these words. If Herod took away all the old foundations, and built a Temple upon new ones, what more decisive determination can there be of his having new built the Temple? It must be acknowledged, if the words are to be interpreted as they generally are interpreted, nothing can be more decisive. But let us enquire whether the words are truly interpreted or not; and, for this purpose, once more recollect the preceding
part

part of the Historian's relation. After having told us that Herod had formed the design of enlarging and raising the Temple of God to a proper height, he introduces him haranguing the Jews, and telling them what it was his design to do.—That it was his design to remedy those defects in the Temple which had proceeded from the necessity and servitude of former times, and to enlarge and heighten it, so as to render it equal in its dimensions to the first Temple. A great and arduous undertaking certainly, and what startled the Jews exceedingly, as imagining he never would be able to accomplish it. However, the Historian tells us, he soon satisfied them, so that they very cheerfully came into his scheme. After this, in the opening of his next section, we are informed, in the words already cited—“Now, when he had removed the old foundations and laid others, he built the Temple upon them one hundred cubits in length, &c.” Who can read this without perplexity and astonishment, if he supposes the words to signify as they are generally interpreted to signify? The intention of Herod, and the proposal he made to the Jews, was, that he would remedy the defects of the Temple, and raise and lengthen it: but here we have him all
at

at once grubbing up the foundations, and laying new ones. What! did not Herod know that a house might be lengthened without pulling it down, and grubbing up the foundations? Was the addition of an attic story to a building a piece of architecture unknown in his days? Wonderful and astonishing this is! But moreover—How happens it that the Historian is so abrupt in his account? Without saying a syllable of the Temple's having been taken down, he begins by telling us that Herod took away the foundations. Surely the Historian ought to have made a little room for getting at the foundations before he had been in such a hurry to remove them. One would have thought he should have removed the edifice first, and not have gone to work directly upon the foundations, with the edifice (for any thing he says to the contrary) all resting upon them. This surely is very extraordinary, and by no means after the way of other Historians. But, besides all this,—If the edifice was to be taken down, what occasion could there be for removing the foundations? This was a useless and most unnecessary piece of expence; for, as the Temple was not to be widened, there could be no manner of occasion for removing the foundations, which
certainly

certainly must have been good, and better than any Herod could have laid in their room, as having been thoroughly settled, and preserved from injury, by the edifice that was upon them. Every one that has but a smattering in architecture knows this; and therefore it is most truly unaccountable, if it was a fact, that Herod removed all the well-settled uninjured foundations of the Temple, for the sake of laying others in their room, which would not, nor possibly could, be half so good. The language, likewise, which the Historian uses upon this occasion, is remarkable, and very suspicious—"Herod, when he had removed the OLD foundations." Why does he say *Ἀρχαῖες*, and not *τὰ νῦν θεμελίες*, or something equipollent to it, and that would not have rendered his phraseology inelegant?—Why must the foundations that *then were* to the Temple be called *αρχαῖες*; *Ἀρχαῖες* seems to imply that the foundations, through the injuries of time, were decayed and worn out; which could not possibly have been the case here; as, by the fabrick's having continued upon them, they had been preserved from injury: so that this likewise, in the common mode of interpretation, appears to be an inexplicable difficulty in the Historian's account. There is another difficulty

F

culty

culty likewise occurs, which, if the common mode of interpretation is just, is equally inexplicable: for, after having told us that Herod having removed the old foundations, &c. he proceeds to inform us, not, as one would have expected, how *Herod* built the Temple, but, in a very different stile, ἀποδομή-
 θε δὲ ὁ ναὸς, “now the Temple was built,” &c. and then goes on describing some of the ornaments of it; and at length, introducing Herod again, he expresses himself in these very remarkable words—περιελάμβανε δὲ καὶ σοαῖς
 μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα, πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτη-
 δάων, καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τῶν πρὶν ὑπερβαλλόμενος ὡς
 ἐκ ἄλλός τις εἶδοκε τὸν ναὸν ἐπικεκροσμημένον—“He
 surrounded the whole Temple with vast por-
 ticos, taking the utmost care that they should
 be in very exact proportion; and outdoing all
 that ever went before him in the sums he ex-
 pended upon the occasion, insomuch that not
 one of his predecessors seems to have *added so
 much to the beauty of the Temple as he did.*” Who
 is able to reconcile this passage with common
 sense, if Herod really had taken down the
 whole of Haggai’s Temple, and built a new
 one in its room? How is it possible that
 the Historian could say this, if in the com-
 pass only of a few preceding lines he thought
 he had insinuated that Herod had new built
 the

the Temple. His predecessors could not possibly have added any thing to the beauty of the Temple if it was all of Herod's building. And he could not possibly have *added more to the beauty of the Temple than any of his predecessors*, if there was no Temple at that time standing which had been beautified by his predecessors; but if he entirely new built the Temple, there certainly was none; and then what meaning is there in the above words? And therefore to rescue the Historian from such palpable nonsense, it must be absolutely pronounced that Herod did not entirely new build the Temple, and that the Historian no where says he did, but the contrary; and that *Ἀνελών τῆς ἀρχαίας θεμελίδος* relates to something that is totally foreign from the interpretation that has been generally put upon the words.

It is to be remembered, then, that when Haggai's Temple was built, the decree which authorised the building it, directed that it should be precisely upon the same spot where the former Temple had stood, only restraining it as to its length and height: it was to be only sixty cubits in length, so that there were forty cubits of the ground plot of the former Temple left unbuilt upon. Now it does not appear, by any account we have in

history of the destruction of the first Temple, that the foundations of it were at all meddled with at the time of its being destroyed. Neither does it appear, by any account we have in history of the building of the second Temple, that the builders disturbed any more of the foundations of the first Temple than was necessary in order to erect a second, of the dimensions directed by the decree. Hence, as they were directed to build their Temple only sixty cubits in length, it is to be presumed that they left the remaining forty cubits of the former foundation undisturbed, and that these so continued till the days of Herod. And this presumption, as it should seem, must stand good till the contrary can be made appear; i. e. till it can be proved that the foundations of the first Temple were all entirely removed, either by the Babylonians, or by the Jews themselves at the building of the second Temple, or in some subsequent period. Now, then, forty cubits of the foundation of the first Temple, remaining when Herod had projected his plan of lengthening the Temple to its first dimensions, and he purposing to continue the building upon the same ground plot as Solomon's was; therefore it was necessary that either he should erect his new building upon
the

the old foundations, or lay new ones ; but it is to be concluded, that the old foundations were now become totally unfit for his purpose, having been exposed for such a series of years to the ravages of time and weather, and other accidents ; and therefore it became necessary for him to remove these old foundations, and to lay new ones in their room, and to build upon them : and so the Historian tells us he did ; for *Ανελὼν τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίους &c.* Hence, then, the argument derived from these words, in order to prove that Herod entirely took down Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room becomes superceded, as they do not appear to have any relation to the foundations of Haggai's Temple, but to those *old* foundations which remained unbuilt upon in the ground plot of Solomon's Temple. Hence our wonder ceases at the Historian for beginning his account with telling us that Herod removed the foundations without having previously said a syllable of his having taken down the edifice that was upon them. Hence we see the reason why he calls the foundations *ἀρχαίαις*. Hence likewise we understand him when he tells us almost in the same breath that Herod added more to the beauty and ornaments of the Temple than any of his predecessors

cessors. And hence also we see how what he did was in conformity with what the Historian had before told us he intended to do. And moreover this enables us to account for the language he uses on occasion of the affair of the Golden Eagle, and serves in some measure to reconcile what he hath here said in this chapter of his Antiquities with what he had before said upon the same subject in his History of the Jewish War ; whereas, if the received interpretation is supposed to stand good, the Historian becomes absurd, irreconcilable with himself, and altogether inexplicable. He makes Herod entirely new build the Temple ; and yet, at the same time, he has told us that he only repaired it. He makes him add more to the beauties of *his own new built Temple* than any of his *predecessors* had done. He makes him remove the foundations of a building before he had taken down the building itself. He makes him put himself to the most wanton unnecessary expence imaginable, by removing foundations in order to lay others just in the same place, which would not be half so good as those he had taken away ; with a hundred other inexplicable absurdities and contradictions.

But doth not the Historian tell us, that after Herod had made his proposal, the Jews
were

were exceedingly anxious and uneasy, fearing lest, when he had set about καταλῦσαι τὸ πᾶν ἔργον, he should not be able to finish what he had proposed. It is certain that the Historian doth speak to this effect, and equally certain, that, by the courtesy of translators, καταλῦσαι τὸ πᾶν ἔργον is rendered “ taking down the whole Temple;” whereas the words, neither by necessity nor implication, signify any such thing. Το πᾶν ἔργον ought to be translated, *all that he intended*, or *all that was necessary on the occasion*, for they certainly do not signify the *whole Temple*. But if they do not signify the whole Temple, what meaning is there in the words that follow? Does not Herod there engage that he will not καθαιρήσῃ τὸν ναὸν take down the Temple till he got every thing ready for finishing it again? He doth say so; but let it be observed, that he doth not say τὸν ἅπαντα ναὸν, which he could say, when he tells us that Herod surrounded it τεταῖς μεγίσταις; so that it is evident that, in the Historian’s style, there is a difference between τὸν ναὸν and τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα. Here, then, let it be considered, that in order to accomplish what Herod had proposed, it was necessary to take down the end wall of the Temple, in order to effect a junction with, and accommodate the new building to it. Let it be farther considered, that, as he was
not

not only to lengthen but to raise some part of the Temple higher than it was before, he must of course be obliged to take down some of the upper works of the Temple. These then seem to be the things which he refers to, when he says that he will not κατὰρξεν τὸν ναὸν till he has got every thing ready for finishing it again; and as the words do by no necessity of interpretation signify that he would take down the whole Temple, we may assuredly conclude that these were the whole of what he referred to in his engagement to the Jews. But, once more. The Historian says, τῷ δὲ ναῷ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων οἰκοδομηθέντος ἐνιαυτῷ καὶ μηνὶ ἑξ—“the whole people were filled with gladness.” If by these words he means to insinuate that the whole Temple from its foundations was completed in 18 months, a more palpable, more impossible falsehood never fell from the pen of any writer; a falsehood which it is not worth while criticising on, and which every reader must immediately, and without the least hesitation, reject with the utmost disdain, as an insult upon his understanding: but if referred to the work of raising the Temple to a greater height, (which work most probably was given in charge to the priests to perform, as Herod, not being a priest himself, was excluded from having any thing to do in

in that business) it then may come within the reach of probability and truth; and the purport of the passage will be, that the priests having completely finished the business of raising the walls of the Temple, and of covering it in, the people were filled with gladness upon the occasion, and celebrated it with much festivity and rejoicing. The concluding passage of this chapter is in these words—*τὰ μὲν ἐν περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐξακοδομήθη τῷ τὸν τρόπον*—strange language this, if it is to signify—“In this manner was the Temple new built, and completely finished;” and yet such must be its signification, if the received interpretation of Josephus is just, in what respects the Temple; and as it is impossible the words can have any such signification, therefore it is a plain proof that the received interpretation is not just. The true literal construction is: “In this manner were the buildings about the Temple (or that related to the Temple) completed;” which no more implies that the Temple had been entirely taken down and new built, than it implies any thing else with which the words have no connection; but is very strongly expressive of repairs and additional buildings; and the Historian could not have used more significant terms in which to have expressed as

G

much.

much. He had before told us that Herod had enlarged the dimensions of the Temple by adding forty cubits to its length; that he had been at the expence of raising it, where it was necessary, to a becoming height; a work which, as it seems, was entrusted to the priests; that he had ornamented and decorated it beyond any thing that any of his predecessors had done; that the work of the priests was finished in a year and half, and that the other works, relating to the porticos, and exterior parts, were built in eight years; and then concludes his account, as above mentioned: "In this manner were the buildings that related to the Temple completed."

Why does he say *τα μεν εν περι των ναων*; Why does he not say *ο μεν εν ναος εξαποδομήθη τῶν τῶν τροπῶν*; Why indeed, except because he knew it was false, and that he had insinuated no such thing in the preceding relation. So that, upon the whole, and without entering into any farther discussion of this matter, if the reader gives any credit to what has been already suggested, it will appear that the whole affair of Herod's new Temple is a mere fiction; not of the Historian, but derived from the negligent blundering manner in which he has been interpreted. It is true, indeed, the Historian hath himself contributed
towards

towards leading his interpreters into this mistake, by the confused negligent manner in which his relation is written; and it is very possible that his negligence was not without a design of misleading his readers, and making them think greater things of Herod than he himself durst affirm of him; and particularly of misleading the Greeks and Romans, for whose amusement he wrote his Antiquities. Some of these he certainly did impose upon; and from them, it is to be presumed, the nonsense of Herod's new Temple has been handed down to our times.

The learned having taken things upon trust, without examination, have followed one another in a direct line; just as certain birds do when they are engaged in a long flight, where the first breaks the air, and the rest follow, without the trouble of opening a path way for themselves; whereas if any of those great and learned persons, who have so quietly acquiesced in the notion of Herod's new Temple, would but have been at the pains of examining the Historian's account, they must inevitably have seen that he was either false, or misinterpreted. In his History of the Jewish War, as already cited, he tells us in the plainest terms imaginable, that no third Temple was ever built at Jerusalem, because

he says Haggai's was the last. In terms likewise that cannot be mistaken, he tells us, in that history, that Herod only repaired the Temple. In that history also he gives a long prolix description of the Temple, but ascribes none of it to Herod, nor even names him as having had any concern in any thing belonging to it, except the castle of Antonia. Ought not every thing then that he wrote afterwards in his Antiquities, which was not consonant with this history, to have been looked upon with a jealous eye? Why was more credit due to him in his Antiquities, than in his History of the Jewish War? In his Antiquities, when he goes directly contrary to what he had before written on the same subject in his History of the War, for the most part, he gives no notice that he is correcting himself; or that he is supplying the defects or omissions in what he had written before, but boldly, and without hesitation, asserts just as it may seem to make for his purpose, or as the humour might take him. Thus, in the 12th book of his Antiquities, he says in express terms, that Antiochus took the city of Jerusalem without resistance—ἀμαχητι λαμβανει την πόλιν, which is not only in direct contradiction to the matter of fact, but in direct contradiction likewise to what he had himself

self before written, in his History of the War (B. 1. C. 1.) And here likewise, if indeed he does say any thing to that effect, that Herod pulled down Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room, it is in direct contradiction to what he says in his History of the War, for there he says Herod only repaired it.

Josephus, in his History of the War, is certainly to be much esteemed as a very valuable Historian, but in his Antiquities he by no means appears under the same character. In them he is fabulous to a great degree; he falsifies records, and then retails his falsehoods as truths. He retails as facts figments merely of his own invention, for the purpose of aggrandizing his people, and making them appear to be of greater consequence in the eyes of the Romans; and where any fact if related would have reflected any disgrace upon them, or would have been ridiculed and made a jest of by the Heathen, there he suppresses the mention of it. These things are so very well known to the readers of Josephus, that it is hardly worth while to refer to any particular instances; one or two however may be mentioned just for the sake of verifying what is
here

here said. In the first book of Samuel xviii. 25. we are told, that Saul ordered David to bring him an hundred foreskins of the Philistines: but Josephus, knowing how odd this would sound in the ears of the Romans, with whom *curtus Judæus* was always a subject of much jest and ridicule, tells us that Saul required of him κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ἑξακοσίας (Antiq. vi. 10.) The golden calf he suppresses all mention of, as he does likewise of Herod's cruelty in the massacre of the innocents. From the mint of his own invention, most probably, he contrived and framed that pretty story which he has related (Ant. xi. 8.) concerning Alexander, and the great respect which he shewed to the Jewish high priest, a circumstance recorded or hinted at by no other historian whatsoever, but that certainly had its tendency towards making the Jews appear of some consequence in the eyes of the heathen. And lastly, what more notorious falsehood was ever uttered than that which we find in his second book against Apion (λγ) where he says Ἀντίκρυς ἡμῖν ὁ νομοθέτης ἀπέφηκεν, "our Lawgiver hath expressly forbidden us to make a jest of or speak disrespectfully of the gods of other nations;" and the same he inculcates in his Antiquities, iv. 8. but more fully: for there he plainly signifies that the
Jews

Jews were prohibited by the law from abusing the idols of the heathens, or destroying their temple, which he must have very little knowledge of the Jewish law who doth not know to be most supremely false. Now he that could pervert and falsify in so positive a law of his own religion, for the purpose of ingratiating himself and his people with the heathen, we may be certain would not be more scrupulous in matters of a different nature; and therefore, when his interpreters saw him ascribing, as they thought, to Herod what it is impossible could be true, if they had received it all, they ought to have received it as problematical; whereas they have swallowed it all greedily as truth; have reasoned from it as from a fact, and have endeavoured to accommodate to it the generally received opinion, received by Jews, Heathens and Christians; that the Temple at Jerusalem which was destroyed by Titus was the second or Haggai's Temple: an impossible attempt, but yet they have endeavoured at it, and would persuade us, that a new Temple at Jerusalem, whose foundations and superstructure were all the work of Herod alone, was with propriety esteemed to be one and the same identical Temple with that which had been built 500 years before
by

by the Prophet Haggai. The greatest and most learned men have given into the opinion; even the very great and learned Archbishop Usher seems to have adopted it for *sub anno ante Christum 16*; speaking of *Constantine l'Empereur*, he hath these words, *In cujus præfatione ex constanti Hebræorum sententiâ ostendit Zerubbabelis et Herodis templum pro eodem recte fuisse habitum*. One would have thought that this constant and general opinion of the Jews would have been a strong proof that Herod had not built any new Temple at Jerusalem; for how could it be Zerubbabel's Temple if it was Herod's? How could it be the second Temple if it was the third? How could it be that Temple which Pompey entered, if it was a Temple which Pompey never saw, and which Herod built after Pompey was dead. Great surely hath been the fascinating power of this supposed testimony of Josephus, that could induce so many of the most learned men in the world to surrender themselves up to so contradictory, so absurd, so impossible an opinion. Certain it is that they have surrendered themselves up to it, and while they have done so, have endeavoured to persuade both themselves and others that the opinion is nevertheless consistent with the truth
of

the Prophecy of Haggai, which it most assuredly is not; for Haggai's Prophecy relates to no other Temple but that which was building when he delivered it; and which Temple, he foretells, was to be filled with a greater glory of the Lord of Hosts than Solomon's was. But this we well know it never was before the days of Herod; and if Herod took it all down, removing even the foundations of it, we know it never was, or could be at any time afterwards; therefore the consequence is, Haggai predicted of the second Temple what never happened to it, and therefore Haggai did prophecy what was not true. But upon such an occasion as this the Historian, if he had said as his interpreters have supposed, must not be complimented with credit at the expence of the Prophet of God—*Numeretur potius princeps inter mendaces Historicus*. Let the Prophet of God be true, whatever may become of the Historian. Josephus himself acknowledges him to have been a Prophet of God, and that God spake to the Jews by him, and that they gave credit to him as such; and therefore if Josephus hath written any thing that is contrary to this acknowledged Prophet, he must not be believed. However it doth not appear that he hath written any thing that is

H

contrary

contrary to, or that at all affects the truth of the Prophecy, if what has been already suggested is admissible. And any sufficient well-grounded reason against its being admitted, perhaps, it may not be easy to produce. Certain it is, that under the received interpretation of his words, the Historian is inconsistent with, and contrary to himself; and equally certain that, under the interpretation which has been suggested, that inconsistency and contrariety is done away; and therefore undoubtedly the suggested interpretation is at least more eligible than the other, and especially as it saves the credit of the Historian, and leaves the truth of the Prophecy unimpeached. However of this the learned must judge, with whom the interpretation is left for their censure or approbation, as it is by no means intended to be obtruded upon them.

Perhaps it may not be amiss to subjoin a remark or two; and first, that the word *δεμαλίσς*, in the Historian's language, is by no means so confined and limited by its connection with other words as to signify precisely and absolutely the foundations of the Temple that was then standing, and nothing else: for though it is said that when Herod had laid other foundations he erected τὸν ναὸν upon them, yet

we

we all know that in the use of the Historian the word *ναός* is applied to a part, or even an appendage of the Temple, as well as to the whole Temple. Moreover it is remarkable that he himself tells us that the word in its true strict acceptation, is applicable only to the sanctuary, of which he says *ὁ ναός ἐν τέλει*, and that Herod was prohibited from having any thing to do with that; therefore when he says Herod *τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε* he means something that was not the sanctuary; consequently, in the passage here referred to, *τὸν ναὸν* doth not signify the whole Temple. But if *θεμελίαις* may not signify the foundations of the whole, much less may it signify the foundations of a part of the Temple. *Ἀνελὼν τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίαις* is too explicit to admit of any such interpretation, it must signify either the whole or none; but as it may not signify the whole, if the Historian is to be interpreted consistently with himself, therefore it hath no relation at all to the foundations of the temple then standing, but relates to some other foundations; which, because he thought it was unnecessary, or for some other reason, best known to himself, the Historian did not think fit particularly to specify: and these, as it should seem, were the foundations remaining unbuilt upon in the ground plot of

Solomon's Temple. And it is very probable that these foundations were still remaining, even to the time of Herod ; for the Jews, considering the plot upon which the edifice of Solomon's Temple had been erected as holy consecrated ground, we may be sure would not suffer any other buildings to be erected there, and much less would they have removed the foundation stones for the sake of applying them to any secular purpose ; and therefore, there, it may be very fairly presumed they continued undisturbed till the time of Herod ; and being there, therefore, it was necessary that Herod, when he entered upon his proposed scheme of lengthening the Temple, must either have built upon those foundations, or have removed them, and laid others in their room ; the latter of which, it is conceived, the Historian tells us he did. But there is another reason why it may be presumed that the foundations did remain to the days of Herod, in that part of the ground plot of Solomon's Temple which was unbuilt upon, and that is in order to be plain and indisputable evidence of the extent of that Temple. From the Prophecy of Haggai it was natural for them to conclude, that their Temple, in some future period of time, would be rendered equal
in

in its dimensions to that of Solomon's. Its glory they knew was to be greater, and they perhaps might think that could not be except it obtained the same extent; and therefore, in expectation that an event of this kind would at some time or other take place, they might religiously leave the foundations undisturbed, to the intent that every thing, when the work should be set about, might be ascertained with accuracy and exactness. It is true, all this is only conjecture, but then it hath nothing improbable in it; on the contrary, it hath much of probability; and in matters of this nature, where we have not the evidence of fact to guide us, we must of necessity be guided by the evidence of probability; and in proportion as the degrees of probability are increased, in the same proportion is its evidence strengthened. Now it is most certain we have no evidence of the foundations being removed at any time, either by the Babylonians or the Jews themselves; and therefore there is no evidence to interrupt us in the supposition that they remained undisturbed, as hath been already concluded. Hence, as the Babylonians did not, and as there is nothing to oppose against the very strong reasons we have for supposing that the Jews would not, remove them, therefore

fore the probability that the foundations did remain undisturbed till the days of Herod is increased to so great a degree that it almost amounts to a direct and certain evidence.

It is true, that which would destroy the whole of what is here suggested, is the observation of the learned Dr. Prideaux, in which perhaps there may be others that do concur with him, but which, at the same time, appears to be most clearly a mistake. For in his Connection (sub anno ante Christum 534) he thus expresseth himself: “ The
 “ difference between the former Temple and
 “ this which was now a building, was so
 “ great that God tells the Prophet Haggai,
 “ that the latter in comparifon with the for-
 “ mer was as nothing, so much did it come
 “ short of it. But this is not to be under-
 “ stood of its bigness; *for the second Temple*
 “ *was of the same dimensions with the first, it be-*
 “ *ing built upon the very same foundations, and*
 “ *therefore it was exactly of the same length*
 “ *and breadth.*” But what saith the decree
 (Ezra vi. 3)—“ In the first year of Cyrus
 “ the king, the same Cyrus the king made
 “ a decree concerning the House of God at
 “ Jerusalem—Let the House be builded in
 “ the place where they offered sacrifices, and
 “ let the foundations thereof be strongly laid;
 “ the

“ *the height thereof threescore cubits, and the*
 “ *breadth thereof threescore cubits.*” From this
 decree it appears most clearly that the learned
 Doctor was mistaken; for, as it doth not
 say that the Temple was to be built of the
 same dimensions with the first; therefore
 there is no reason to conclude from the de-
 cree that the dimensions were the same. But
 there is the greatest reason in the world to
 conclude from the decree, that the dimen-
 sions were not the same: for the decree di-
 rects that the *breadth* of the Temple shall be
 sixty cubits, without taking any notice at all
 of the length, and therefore the length was
 included in the breadth, which is the case of
 every square building; consequently the de-
 cree directs that the Temple to be built
 should be a square of sixty cubits. But the
 first Temple was not a square of sixty cubits;
 for, although in breadth it was sixty, in its
 length it was an hundred, therefore it ex-
 ceeded the second Temple in its dimensions
 by forty cubits. It is a little surprising that
 the learned Doctor should have fallen into a
 mistake of this kind, which is not only op-
 posed by the decree itself, but by the cir-
 cumstances which attended the execution of
 the decree; for, when the ancients saw the
foundations of the second Temple laid, we are
 told

told they wept with a loud voice. But if the foundations were laid exactly in the same extent as the foundations of the former Temple, what possible inducement could they have for this ? instead of a cause of sorrow to them it ought to have been the contrary, a cause of great joy ; therefore, beside the testimony of the decree itself, this circumstance affords very strong evidence that the foundations of the second Temple were not laid, as the learned Doctor hath surmised, exactly in the same extent with the foundations of the first. It is presumed nothing farther need be said to obviate any objection which might be derived from so palpable a mistake as this. The decree directs that the House of God shall be builded threescore cubits in breadth, without mentioning any thing of its length, therefore it was to be threescore cubits each way, consequently a square ; but Solomon's Temple was sixty cubits in breadth, and an hundred in length, therefore the second Temple in its extent was forty cubits short of Solomon, and consequently forty cubits of the ground plot of Solomon's Temple were left unbuilt upon.

It is hardly conceivable that any one will object to what has been said from the title which is prefixed to the last chap. Antiq. xv.
left

left however any one should, it may be proper to observe, first, that the titles are supposed, and with good reason, not to have been affixed to the chapters by Josephus himself, but by some other, whose head running on the nonsensical notion of Herod's new Temple, he thought fit, instead of *κατεσκευασε*, to write *ὡς Ἡρώδης τὸν ναὸν μετεσκευασε*, which at the same time the Historian nowhere says; however, if he had said it, there would have been no great difficulty in getting over it, since he who changes a building from a square to a parallelogram may most truly be said to have altered the form of it, and that Herod did this is not denied, for he added forty cubits to the length of it, and thereby rendered the Temple, instead of a square of sixty cubits, a parallelogram, whose longest sides were an hundred cubits; so that let what will have rattled in the head of the prefixer of the title, the term he has used affords no just ground for objecting to what has been said, since the figure of a building may be changed in an hundred instances without any kind of necessity of pulling it down and new building it.

But there is one other objection to what has been said, which may be thought of a more significant nature, derived from the se-

cond chapter of St. John's gospel, wherein, as it is thought, Herod's new built Temple is referred to. Our Saviour had said to the Jews, " Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up ;" and they in reply to him say τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν ἀποδομήθη ὁ ναὸς ὁτος, which in our translation is thus rendered, " forty and six years was this Temple in building ;" which some very learned men have conceived to have been a mistranslation, and in the translation of the very learned Archbishop Usher is thus rendered—*Quadraginta et sex annis hætenus ædificatum est Templum hoc* : in English thus—it is now forty and six years since this Temple was built, or hath been built ; which at the same time, if it really expresses the Archbishop's meaning, is a strange translation ; because, if the Jews answered our Saviour in this manner, their answer is nothing to the purpose. Their intention evidently was to inhance the difficulty of building the Temple in three days. But what was it to the purpose how long the Temple had been built ? How did that inhance the difficulty of building it in three days ? Suppose then the Archbishop's meaning to be more truly expressed by these words—*It is now forty and six years that this Temple hath been in building*. This indeed may apply,

apply, and such an answer as this may be pertinent, but then it is a question whether *hath been in building* is a more allowable translation of *ᾠκοδομήθη* than *was in building*, it should seem that it is not. Be this however as it may, none of the translations have any tendency to prove that the Temple was taken down and rebuilt by Herod. Moreover it should seem as if this criticism of *Lidiatt's* (for from him the Archbishop derives it) is not just, and that *ᾠκοδομήθη* is to be rendered either *was built*, or *hath been built*, as the words with which it is in connection may direct, for if it is always to be rendered *hath been*, it will make strange work with Josephus, as also with many other Greek writers. Till after the Reformation it does not appear that this answer of the Jews to our Saviour was ever interpreted as relating to any thing but Haggai's Temple, to which it was conceived the words were applicable, though how they were applicable to it was never clearly made out, as chronologers differed exceedingly from one another upon the subject. Perhaps, even in the Archbishop's application of the words, there may be some difficulty in making out the chronology, so as to answer with exactness; and perhaps likewise there may be no

application of the words whatever in which the chronology can be exact. For the saying itself may not, for any thing we know to the contrary, be exactly true. It is by no necessity a truth, because it was the reply of the Jews to our Saviour. We are under no obligation to persuade ourselves that it is true, because the Evangelist hath recorded it as the reply of the Jews. It might be, and most probably was, a tradition among them, that the Temple was forty and six years in building, and yet the tradition might not have been accurately exact, or if it was exact might depend upon certain circumstances to which we are entire strangers, and concerning which we now can obtain no intelligence; and therefore any argument drawn from hence in favour of a new built Temple by Herod is of no validity at all.* It should

* The Archbishop, for the purpose of making out the Chronology, reckons from the 21st year of Herod, which 21st year of Herod complete, happened 13 years before the birth of Christ. Now the 13th year before Christ was the 3987th year of the world: and the year of the world in which the matter under consideration happened was 4034; and thus, from the 21st of Herod complete, to the time of our Saviour's first entering personally upon his ministry, will be 47 years complete. But the Archbishop governs himself by the years of the Julian period, and making the 21st year of Herod coincident with the 4697th year of that period, that will be just 46 years to the time of our Saviour's entering upon his ministry. But this likewise is liable to objections; for, if allowed, Herod must have been more than two years in providing his materials,

seem as if this new translation of *ἡνδομένη* had been received for the sole purpose of giving a sanction to the adopted notion of Herod's having new built the Temple, and to enable the supporters of it to justify themselves by some other testimony, beside the supposed testimony of Josephus, on which testimony it otherwise alone depends. For, though it is said that the Talmud takes notice of Herod's marble Temple at Jerusalem, that testimony is too late to be of any authority; and besides, the Talmud might use this language, and speak of the Temple at Jerusalem with propriety enough under the title of Herod's marble Temple, on account of the marble casings, and additional buildings which he had made to it. And there is no manner of occasion for supposing that Herod took down the whole of Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room, in order to reconcile what the Talmud saith with propriety of language or truth. But concerning the passage in St. John, if it must be referred to the time when Herod first entered upon his works about the Temple (for which, at the same time, there does not seem

rials, and besides, why should we not reckon from the 15th year of Herod, as well as from the 21st, the authority being just the same in both cases, that is Josephus himself.

to

to be any kind of necessity) let us see whether it cannot be made out so as to correspond with that without supposing the Temple to have been entirely taken down. The Evangelist then tells us that Jesus found *in the Temple* ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ those that sold oxen, sheep, &c. and that he drove them all *out of the Temple* ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, and that when the Jews asked him what sign he shewed since he did these things; he answered them, Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τῶτον ἢ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν—"Destroy *this Temple*, and in three days I will rear it up again." In reply to which the Jews, not rightly understanding him, make answer: "Forty and six years hath *this Temple* ὁ ναὸς ὅτος been in building," &c. Here then the first thing to be taken notice of is the variation of the Evangelist's phrase from ἱερόν to ναός the next thing is, that Jesus having been driving the sellers out of the Temple, he most probably, when the Jews questioned him, was in the exterior parts of the Temple, those parts which had been new built by Herod; therefore when he answered them, saying, "Destroy *this Temple*," they thinking, by his using the word τῶτον that he meant particularly that part of the Temple in which they then were, reply to him ὁ ναὸς ὅτος—"THIS Temple hath been forty and six years

years in building," &c. and so the words may well apply without any necessary supposition or implication, that the whole Temple had been entirely taken down and rebuilt by Herod; and therefore, as the words may apply in this manner, no argument can fairly be drawn from hence to justify the notion which has been derived from the common interpretation of Josephus; a notion which, if any credit is given to what hath been already said, cannot be maintained without the greatest inconsistency as being totally destitute of any foundation in truth.

Having thus, then, obviated any objection which might be derived from this passage in St. John, and no other objection occurring that particularly requires to be taken notice of, what remains now is to consider the Prophecy of Haggai, at least as far as it is connected with the subject of our present discussion, in order to shew that, interpret it how you will, it hath no truth in it, if it is a truth that Herod pulled down and demolished the foundations of the Temple which was building when the Prophecy was delivered. Now there are two modes of interpreting it. The one is adopted by those who think it relates solely to the material building, and the ornaments and decorations
it

it was in future to receive, whereby it would be rendered a more magnificent Temple than Solomon's; and the other is that which supposes it to be a prophecy of the Messiah, who, by his advent and personal manifestation in it, would fill it with the divine glory, and thereby render it superior to Solomon's. There is indeed a third way of interpreting the Prophecy (if it may be called interpreting) and that is, by discarding the literal meaning of it, so that the words *this house* shall not signify *this house*, but a future dispensation of religion, and thus turning the whole into a metaphor. But this needs no confutation, as it will be thought sufficient to have mentioned it.

Now the first mode of interpreting the Prophecy proceeds upon this supposition, that the word which in the English translation is rendered "desire" is improperly so rendered, and that it ought to be translated "desirable or precious things," and thus, instead of "the desire of all nations shall come," the passage will be, the "desirable or precious things of all nations shall come;" and as it is farther supposed that these were to come for the purpose of decorating and beautifying the Temple, therefore the greater glory which the Prophet promises to the building was to be

be derived from them, and them only, without any regard to the personal appearance of the Messiah in it, who, it is contended, never did appear in it at all, it having been all taken down, and its foundations all demolished, before he was born, by Herod. But the favourers of this interpretation forget a very material circumstance, and it is that, if what they say is true, the Temple was all taken down before the Prophecy ever had any accomplishment, according to their own interpretation. For they do not deny but that the Prophecy foretells that the second Temple should be more splendid and magnificent in the richness of its decorations and beauty, than Solomon's. They do not deny this because it is the thing they insist upon, and because they maintain that it is all that is meant by the Prophet, when he says, "the glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." Now then let them shew when this *their* Prophecy (for by this interpretation they have made it their own) ever had any accomplishment, prior to the supposed demolition of the Temple by Herod. The surmise of the learned Doctor Herberden, as already cited, extends no farther than to a supposition that the second Temple did in process of time become equal to the

first in every thing, except in its not having the ark and shechinah. But this surely will not be called the accomplishment of a prophecy which in express terms saith—"The glory of this latter House shall be GREATER than of the former. But the learned Dr is altogether mistaken; for the material building of the second Temple never was, nor, antecedent to the 21st of Herod, ever could have been, equal to the first. For, if it had, what occasion had Herod to take it down, as the learned Doctor supposes he did? Would he have taken down, as defective, a building that in the superbness and magnificence of its structure was equal to Solomon's. Let the learned Doctor recollect the words of Herod's harangue to the Jews, as recorded by Josephus, and then he will see, if he gives any credit to the Historian, how impossible it is that his supposition can be true; for Herod there tells them that the Temple which their fathers built after their return from Babylon was not equal to Solomon's, because it was neither so large nor so high; that the first builders were restrained from making it equal by Cyrus and Darius; and that afterwards, through a variety of causes, no opportunity had occurred of remedying these defects. Therefore the Temple was built defective, and

and not equal to Solomon's, and continued defective, and not equal to Solomon's till the 18th year of Herod, when this harangue is supposed to have been made. Hence then it appears most plainly that the Doctor's supposition never did take place antecedent to the time of Herod; and if Herod did as the Doctor supposes, take the whole Temple down and demolish the foundations of it, that it never did and never could take place at any time. So that, after all, nothing will be gotten by giving a construction to the word חמדת so different from that generally received. The design of giving it the construction of "desirable or precious things" is in order to accommodate the Prophecy to the supposition. But the supposition is itself false and groundless, and therefore no end can possibly be answered by an attempt to accommodate the prophecy to it by this construction. Moreover the construction is in itself absurd, because it is equivocal, and because no particular idea is ascertained by it. For "the desirable or precious things of all nations" may signify "the things which all nations desire, the things which are precious in the eyes of all nations;" or may signify "the desirable and precious things which the several nations of the world can peculiarly supply."

supply." And which of these two significations is to be adopted? If the first, then we may as well adhere to the Bible translation; and if the second, then we shall get much more than we want; for then we shall have fables and tin and rhubarb, and a hundred other things of a similar nature, peculiar to the several nations of the world. But how these should contribute towards rendering the Temple, which was building when the Prophecy was delivered, more splendid than Solomon's, it will be difficult to determine. But it will be said, it is absurd to suppose that such things as these should be meant. Those only are alluded to by which the Temple could be ornamented. When it is so expressed in the Prophecy then it shall be allowed, but assuredly not till then. For till the words (if they must be so translated) "the precious things of all nations shall come," can truly be interpreted to signify much less than the words do certainly express, there must be included in their signification not only silver and gold, but mace and cloves, and a numberless farrago of other such articles peculiar to, and the precious things of, the several nations of the world. Moreover, if we suppose the Prophet says "the precious things of all nations shall come," yet it is
not

not said whither nor for what end, it is only said in general, without any kind of specification, “the precious things of all nations shall come.” It will not do to say they were to come for the purpose of ornamenting the Temple, for the Prophet doth not say so. And besides, very little glory would accrue to the Temple from its being filled with, and made a storehouse for, merchandise, as must be the case, if the words “precious things” are interpreted in the one sense; and if interpreted in the other, the words do not apply at all; for, how would it add to the glory of the Temple because the things should come which were desirable and precious in the eyes of all nations? But, however this matter may be, nothing certainly will be gained by interpreting the word חֲמֻדָּה “precious things,” since, if the Temple was taken down by Herod, it never did or could experience a greater glory than Solomon’s. As, then, it is so certain that the Prophecy never had any accomplishment, according to the first mode of interpreting it, if the supposed relation of Josephus is true; so likewise, in such case, it is equally certain that the Prophecy never had any accomplishment, if interpreted according to the second mode of interpretation, which proceeds upon this supposition, that
it

it is a prophecy of the advent of the Messiah, who should be personally manifested in that Temple which was then building; and, by his divine presence in it, should give such a lustre and glory to it as Solomon's never had experienced, and that thereby the glory of the latter House should be greater than of the former. But as it is well known that the Messiah did not come into the world till after the 21st of Herod. If Herod did then pull down and demolish all the foundations of the Temple, it will be impossible that the Messiah ever could have been manifested in it; and therefore of course it follows, that according to this mode of interpretation neither had the Prophecy ever any accomplishment. Hence therefore as the Prophecy, interpret it how you will, never had any accomplishment, if the supposed relation of Josephus is true, and moreover now never can have any accomplishment; it follows that the Prophecy itself is not a true prophecy. But as all parties are agreed to acknowledge, and as the Historian himself (Antiq. xi. 4.) acknowledges it, that Haggai was a true Prophet; therefore the supposed relation of Josephus is a false relation, and the Prophecy of Haggai a true prophecy. And a true Prophecy it most assuredly is of the advent of the

the Messiah, and of his personal manifestation in the second Temple, which came to pass in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, when the glory of the Lord of Hosts was displayed visibly in the Temple, according to what the holy Prophet had foretold.

And indeed any other application of the Prophecy than to the Messiah, is wholly inadmissible, even though it should be granted that "the desire of all nations" is not a just translation. For prior to the time of Herod we have the most satisfactory assurance that the Temple never obtained the same extent with Solomon's; and we are certain likewise that it continued defective both in point of extent and height till Herod's time; and therefore, during all that time, instead of being superior, it continued inferior in splendor and magnificence to the Temple of Solomon; consequently the Prophecy cannot be applied as foretelling that before the days of Herod the glory (i. e. the magnificence) of the latter House should be greater than of the former. Neither is it applicable, even after all the sumptuous enlargements of it and additions which were made to it in the days of Herod. For even supposing, (which will not easily be proved) that by those enlargements and additions it became superior in point of magnificence to
the

the first Temple, it still was defective. It had neither the ark nor the shechinah. It had not the glory of Jehovah in it as the first Temple had, for the want of which no magnificence of structure, no splendor or extravagance of decorations could by any means compensate. And it is to be observed that the Prophecy doth not specifically predict that the greater glory of the second Temple should arise from the greater richness and splendor of its ornaments and decorations. The Prophet saith—"The Lord of Hosts will fill this House with glory, and greater shall be the glory of this latter House than of the former saith the Lord of Hosts." Therefore that which is specifically promised is, that the Lord of Hosts would fill this House with glory, and that he would fill it with a greater glory than that with which the former Temple had been filled. Therefore it was his glory, the glory of the Lord of Hosts with which it was to be filled. But he must be distracted that says the glory of the Lord of Hosts consists in silver and gold, or such things as are valuable and precious among the nations of the world, and it is not worth an argument to confute such an extravagant notion. The Prophet moreover saith that the latter House was to have a
greater

greater glory than the former ; but as he had before told us that the Lord of Hosts would fill this House with glory, therefore it of course follows that the Lord of Hosts would fill it with the greater glory, which he here foretells it was to have. Now the glory with which the former House was filled, we have described 1 Kings, viii. 10, 11. “ And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the Holy place, that the cloud filled *the house of the Lord*, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud ; *for the GLORY of the Lord had FILLED the house of the Lord.*” With the glory then of this majestic though symbolical exhibition of the Divine presence was the former Temple filled. But the Prophet tells us that the Temple then building should be *filled* with a *greater* glory than this. Therefore he prophesies that there should be an exhibition of the divine presence in this Temple, not enveloped in the darkness of a cloud, but personal and visible ; consequently he promises that the second Temple should have a greater glory of the Divine presence than the former had ; for as the first Temple had the glory of the Divine presence symbolically exhibited in it ; if the second Temple had not a greater glory of the Divine presence ex-

L

bited

bited in it, it would not have had a greater glory than the first. But how or when was the glory of the Lord manifested in the second Temple with greater lustre and majesty than in the first, except in the person of the Messiah ; who, as the Apostle tells us, is the *brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person* (Heb. 1.) i. e. The glory of the Lord *without a cloud*, that greater glory with which the Prophet foretold the Temple should be filled. Sufficient surely for the accomplishment of the Prophecy was the presence of so divine a person in the Temple, and greater most undoubtedly greater was the glory of the second Temple than of the first, when the ἀπαύγασμα, the splendid the unclouded irradiation of the glory of the Lord was exhibited in it in the person of the Messiah.

But this greater glory promised to the Temple is not the only mark whereby the Prophecy is distinguished to be a prediction of the Messiah, it concludes in terms equally characteristic, equally directed towards him. “ And in this place will I give peace saith the Lord of Hosts.” Peace of mind, saith the Septuagint, but without any the least shadow of authority. Peace of mind, say they who wish to exclude the personal manifestation of the Messiah in the Temple
from

from being at all referred to by the Prophecy. But is not this low, groveling, little in the extreme? Were the Jews all maniacs at the time, that the Prophet should tell them they should have peace of mind if they would assist in completing the Temple? Strange! that great minds should suffer themselves to be possessed with such little notions. “In this place will I give peace saith the Lord of Hosts.” i. e. In this place shall be given the peace of the Lord of Hosts. And what is the peace of the Lord of Hosts? What indeed but peace and reconciliation with God through the Messiah, who was to be manifested in this place, and who is our **PEACE**, *and the Prince of peace*. What was the gratulatory hymn of the angels when they announced the birth of the Messiah—**GLORY** to God in the highest, **PEACE** on earth, good will towards men, all framed as it were out of this Prophecy of Haggai. The *εὐδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, intimating that now would be accomplished in the acceptance which all nations should meet with at the hands of God; those blessings which were promised by the Prophecy, when it was said the desire of all nations should come; for such undoubtedly is the true signification of this passage, although perhaps not the strict literal translation

tion of the words. Upon the whole, then, as it seems to be impossible to reconcile the Prophecy with truth by any other application of it than to the Messiah, for by any other application of it it never had any accomplishment; therefore it may certainly be concluded that every interpretation of the Prophecy which excludes it from having reference to the Messiah, is without foundation. For if the word חמדת is to have the construction which such interpreters chuse to give it, and which assuredly doth not belong to it, still it will be of no avail, because the Prophecy doth not say that the Temple shall be filled with the precious things of all nations. The Prophecy doth not say that the glory with which the Temple shall be filled, shall be derived from these precious things. But it saith that it shall be filled with the glory of the Lord of Hosts, in which the precious things of all nations can have no concern, since they are infinitely beneath him. The Prophecy moreover doth not say that the glory of the latter Temple by the introduction into it of the precious things of all nations, should be rendered superior to the glory of the former; for the introduction of the precious things of ten thousand worlds into it would not alone make it equal to the Temple

Temple of Solomon, which was filled with the glory of Jehovah. But the Prophecy saith that Jehovah of Hosts (not all nations with their precious things) would fill it with glory, and that the glory of this latter House should be greater than of the former. That is, by a more glorious manifestation of Jehovah's presence in it than was exhibited in the Temple of Solomon.

And lastly, the Prophecy doth not conclude with that poor, miserable, jejune stuff which we meet with in the Septuagint; and and which never was in any Hebrew copy of the prophecy extant in the world; but it concludes in the same strong and powerful language in which it began: "And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts." And what that signifies let the angels explain, who announced the advent of the Messiah into the world.

It may not be proper that these pages should be closed without taking some notice of a suggestion which the learned Dr. Herberden hath made in the book already cited. And it is, that our translation of the word חמדה is contrary to all the old versions, and that no such translation would ever have been thought of if the Vulgate Latin had not rendered

dered the word *desideratus*; which suggestion, as implying two things that cannot be granted, it will be necessary to consider. The first is, that the Vulgate is of no antiquity, and consequently of no authority at all, except as far as the Romish Church has stamped authority upon it; and the second, that all the old versions have an authority which the Vulgate hath not.

With regard to the Vulgate there are three opinions concerning it. The one is, that it is the work of Jerome, who translated the Old Testament into Latin from the original Hebrew.

The second is, that the Vulgate which we have now is not that translation which was made by Jerome, but the old italic version which was made in the apostolic age, or very near to it.

And the third is, that it is neither one nor the other precisely, but a compound of both; which latter, for reasons too long to be inserted here, and well known to the learned, seems to be the truth. For it is certain that both versions, the Italic and Jerome's version, continued to be in use in the church in the sixth century, and perhaps longer, and then probably, it being found inconvenient to have two different translations of the same scriptures

tures in use in the Church, it was thought adviseable to blend them both together, so as to give satisfaction to the favourers of each version, which seems to be the best account, and nearest to the truth of any that can be given of the Vulgate as we have it at this day. Hence therefore it appears that the Vulgate certainly hath some antiquity, and as far as that authority goes, hath likewise the authority of antiquity, without at all appealing to the fictitious authority stamped upon it by the Court of Rome at the Council of Trent. For if it be supposed to be throughout the version which Jerome made in the 4th century, it is then at least 1400 years old.* If instead of Jerome's it is supposed

* When Jerome's version was first published (it being so contrary to the versions from the Septuagint then in circulation) it raised a great clamour against him. In answer to which he replies; "that he could say, and say it with the utmost confidence, and that he could produce a number of witnesses to the truth of what he said, that in no single instance had he departed in his translation from the truth of the Hebrew. If therefore, says he, my version is different from the ancient versions, *interroga quemlibet Hebræorum et liquide prævidebis me ab æmulis frustra lacerari &c.*" And this he repeats more than once; that he was not conscious to himself of having departed in the least degree from the truth of the original Hebrew, and refers his calumniators to any Jew of their own choice whom they could confide in, who would satisfy them whether he had or not.

Is it not wonderful that no Jew upon this challenge would convict him of falshood in his version of the Prophecy of Haggai, if that version is not according to the Hebrew?

to

to be the old Italic version, it is then a great deal older, and is very nearly coetaneous with the days of the Apostles; and if it is (as most probably it is) a compound of those two versions, then it will be found to consist of a mixed antiquity, the lowest degree of which will be from the 4th century. So that the Vulgate is not so despicable in point of authority as the suggestion of the learned Doctor might induce the reader to imagine; and in fact hath as good a claim to authority as almost any of those versions which are set in opposition to it, which none of them have any other claim to authority than that which is derived from their antiquity.

The first Christian version of the Old Testament that we know of, or at least what is supposed to be the first, is the old *Syriac*; which, as we are told, was made in the days of the Apostles themselves, and directly from the Hebrew. But how far this is true we know not, nor at this time of day is it possible for us to determine. However the learned seem in general to be of opinion, that it was made within the first century after Christ, and give it the character of being the best of all the ancient versions. But whereas they say it was made directly from the original Hebrew, that will admit of some doubt, as there
are

are instances wherein it doth not correspond with the original Hebrew.

The next version in point of time, if not equal in age with the Syriac, was the Italic version, which was the Vulgate of the Latin Church, and continued to be so till the end of the fourth century, and for many years after. But this version was not made from the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint, and therefore no doubt contained all the errors of that translation.

The next was the version of Aquila, an apostate from Christianity to Judaism; who, although he affected to make it *verbum verbo* from the Hebrew, yet did it in such a manner as to render it most opposite to the purposes of Christianity, and therefore it was in great estimation with the Jews, who, rejecting the Septuagint in all their disputes with the Christians, made use of Aquila's version instead of the Septuagint.

After Aquila's followed the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion, who were both *Ebionites*, a mongrel sect, which professed to believe in Jesus Christ as the Messiah, but withal observed circumcision, and all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish law, esteeming of Jesus Christ no otherwise than as of a mere man. Their versions therefore may be called

M rather

rather perversions of the Scriptures than any thing else, as calculated to justify themselves and their sect in their several wild and fantastic opinions.

Besides these we have an account of three other Greek versions, or rather partial versions of the Old Testament, which were preserved by Origen in his Hexapla, but when or by whom made is not known; they are now all lost, and therefore those which have been already mentioned are all the old versions (made since the promulgation of Christianity) which possibly can be referred to, when it is suggested that the Vulgate Latin is in opposition to all the old versions. Other versions doubtless there are, old with respect to us, but subsequent to the time of Jerome, which do not translate as the Vulgate hath translated in the matter before us; and how should they? for these versions being all made from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew, it can be nothing extraordinary that they do not express themselves consonant to the Vulgate, where it was not made from the Septuagint but from the Hebrew. So that, upon the whole, the suggestion that our translation is contrary to all the old versions, and that no such version would ever have been thought of if the Vulgate Latin had not rendered the word חמדת *desideratus*, is a suggestion

gestion that hath not any sufficient foundation. The versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, whatever they may be in this matter, can be of no consequence, considering the men and their designs. The Italic version was made from the Septuagint, and therefore, if it had remained perfect till this time, would have been of no validity in a matter of this nature; and the old Syriac, if it renders the passage in dispute conformable to the Septuagint, we need not hesitate to pronounce, notwithstanding the encomiums bestowed upon it, that it was made from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew; and as for any of the other versions, such as a second Syriac, made in the sixth century, the Arabic, the Gothic, &c. if they do not translate as Jerome doth it is of no manner of consequence; for, as they are confessedly translated from the Septuagint, it would have been marvellous indeed if the translators had expressed the sense of the Hebrew, which they were not translating, instead of the sense of the Septuagint, which they were.

It cannot be but with great reluctance, and even pain, that any one finds himself obliged to differ upon such a subject as this from a person of Dr. Heberden's great worth and eminence,

eminence. But assuredly in the present instance the Doctor appears to be much mistaken. And as mistakes are not always confined to individuals, or limited in their consequences, it was thought necessary to take notice of these mistakes of the Doctor, lest by any means they should obtain a patronage which they are not entitled to, under the sanction of so very respectable a character.

THE END.

4 00 58

